UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,676	01/26/2004	Jesse Shu	0023-0214	9884
44987 HARRITY & H	7590 09/12/200 IARRITY, LLP	EXAMINER		
11350 Random SUITE 600		NALVEN, ANDREW L		
FAIRFAX, VA 22030			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2134	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/12/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/765,676	SHU ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	ANDREW L. NALVEN	2134
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be twill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from (6), cause the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 J	s action is non-final. ince except for formal matters, pi	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7,9-11 and 22-27 is/are pending in 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1-7, 9-11 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 22-27 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 26 January 2004 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 2015.	e: a) accepted or b) objected or by objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. So tion is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [ 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date

Application/Control Number: 10/765,676 Page 2

Art Unit: 2134

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-7, 9-11, and 22-27 are pending.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claims as currently presented can be interpreted as purely software. Software only claims fail the requirements of § 101 because software fails to fall into one of the four categories of statutory invention.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-7, 9-11, and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Syvanne et al EP 1,317,112 in view of Kavanagh US PGPub 2003/

Application/Control Number: 10/765,676

Page 3

Art Unit: 2134

- 4. With regards to claim 22, Syvanne teaches a system for screening incoming packets (Syvanne, paragraph 0012, stateful filtering of packets), comprising: a GTP firewall having a GTP communication module (Syvanne, paragraph 0034, firewall with GTP tunnel communications passing through) and a firewall session list and removing inactive firewall sessions from the firewall session list when the tear down engine receives the instruction (Syvanne, paragraph 0022, firewall deletes entries in its entity table, paragraph 0041, receives message from other firewall and updates/deletes sessions). Syvanne fails to teach a firewall tear down engine. However, Kavanagh teaches a Gi communication module that is operable to receive an instruction from the GTP communication module to tear down a firewall session (Kavanagh, paragraph 0010, receives Detach Request message and initiates tunnel tear down, paragraph 0046, detach message passes through firewall). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Kavanagh's method of tearing down tunnels with GTP Detach Requests because it offers the advantage of reducing malicious attacks because system resources are not wasted because all GTP requests require a response (Kavanagh, paragraph 0011).
- 5. **With regards to claim 23**, Syvanne as modified teaches the GTP firewall is operable to detect a GTP tunnel tear down (Kavanagh, paragraph 0010, receives Detach Request message and initiates tunnel tear down).
- 6. **With regards to claim 24**, Syvanne as modified teaches the GTP firewall is operable to detect a firewall session end (Syvanne, paragraph 0032, connection moved from being handled by one firewall to another, paragraph 0022, firewall deletes entries

Art Unit: 2134

in its entity table, paragraph 0041, receives message from other firewall and updates/deletes sessions).

- 7. **With regards to claim 25**, Syvanne as teaches a GTP firewall includes a Gn firewall provided at a Gn interface (Syvanne, paragraph 0034, firewall 305 between SGSN and GGSN).
- 8. Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Syvanne et al EP 1,317,112 and Kavanagh US PGPub 2003/0081607, as applied to claim 22 above, and in further view of Gopal et al "User plane Firewall for 3G Mobile Network."
- 9. With regards to claim 26, Syvanne as modified fails to teach the GTP firewall includes a Gp firewall provided at a Gp interface. However, Gopal teaches the GTP firewall includes a Gp firewall provided at a Gp interface (Gopal, page 2118, stateful firewall at Gp interface). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Gopal's method of providing a firewall at the Gp interface because it offers the advantage of defending against attacks that are targeted at the wireless infrastructure (Gopal, page 2118).
- 10. With regards to claim 27, Syvanne as modified fails to teach the GTP firewall is located on a device; and the Gi firewall is located on the device. However, Gopal teaches the GTP firewall is located on a device; and the Gi firewall is located on the device (Gopal, page 2117, column 2, firewall policy at Gi interface). At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

Application/Control Number: 10/765,676 Page 5

Art Unit: 2134

utilize Gopal's method of including a Gi firewall on the device because it offers the advantage of reducing the vulnerability of future telecommunications networks to attacks while still allowing voice and streaming services for users to pass from the user plane (Gopal, page 2117).

# Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 1-7 and 9-11 are allowed.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANDREW L. NALVEN whose telephone number is (571)272-3839. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 8-6, Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kambiz Zand can be reached on 571 272 3811. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/765,676 Page 6

Art Unit: 2134

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew L Nalven/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2134